REMARKS

The above amendments and these remarks are submitted in reply to the Office Action dated 2005-8-25. Claims 1 – 18 were pending at last examination. Claims 7 – 12 have been canceled. Claims 1 – 6 and 13 – 18 have been amended.

No new matter has been added, the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed. Entry of the amendment, including deletion of claims 7 – 12 is requested.

With respect to claim amendments, Applicants have not dedicated to the public or abandoned any unclaimed subject matter and have not acquiesced to any rejections or objections by the Patent Office as to claims 1 – 6 and 13 – 18. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue prosecution on any presently excluded subject matter in one or more future continuation and/or divisional application(s).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants' remarks are presented in the same order in which they were raised in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The examiner has written

Applicant uses the language like "allowing" or "permitting" a computer to do something. Recognize that all these claims require is that a reference does not prohibit a computer from doing the recited acts. They do not cause any functionality to occur in the computer.

Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 1, 3 and 15 have been amended to recite the limitations as required steps and no longer include "allowing", "permitting" or similar language. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments overcome the grounds for rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections as to claims under 1, 3 and 15 35 USC § 112, ¶2.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moos (US 5,881,152) (hereinafter "Moos") in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852) (hereinafter " Kramer") and further in view of Shpuntov et al (US 5,917,928) (hereinafter " Shpuntov").

Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled. Therefore, their rejection is moot.

Claims 1 – 6 and 13 – 18 have been amended.

(i) Rejection of claim 1 over Moos (US 5,881,152) in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852).

The examiner has written:

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Moos teaches: … (3) once the trusted relationship has been established, allowing the calling process access to **retrieve a directory of service areas** in the protected area [i.e., copying of the stored information can be prevented or verified using information generated and managed by the processor and stored on the data storage device (column 3, lines 32-34)]; …

(Emphasis added)

Applicant submits that Moos is entirely silent as to "Directory" or any equivalent, still less "retrieving a directory of service areas." Directory is clearly specified in claim 1, and supported by the specification and drawings. For example FIG.2 shows a directory, FIG.6 shows a retrieve directory request, and the summary of the invention at page 3 line 11 refers to directory of service areas in the protected area.

Moreover, the examiner has not alleged that Kramer or Shpuntov suggest or teach "Directory" or "retrieving a directory of service areas" as recited in claim 1. Indeed Kramer and Shpuntov are equally silent as to Directory and its equivalents.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to expressly recite "retrieving a directory of service areas." Therefore it is respectfully submitted that neither Moos, Kramer and/or Shpuntov, individually or in combination teach all the limitations of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is respectfully requested for the reason stated.

(ii) Rejection of claim 2 over Moos (US 5,881,152) in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852).

Applicant submits that claim 2 as originally filed and as amended depends from claim 1, and incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. Claim 2 is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 as amended.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is respectfully requested for the reason stated.

(iii) Rejection of claim 3 over Moos (US 5,881,152) in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852).

Applicant submits that claim 3 as originally filed and as amended depends from claim 1, and incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. Claim 3 is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 as amended.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is respectfully requested for the reason stated.

(iv) Rejection of claims 6-7, 12-13, 18 over Moos (US 5,881,152) in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852).

The examiner has further written:

e. Referring to claims 6-7, 12-13, 18:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above
…

Claims 7 and 12 have been canceled. Therefore, rejection of these claims is moot.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1.

Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable for the same reason as claim 1 from which it depends. Moreover, claim 6, as amended recite the use of SETMAX address which is not taught or implied from the cited references.

Independent claim 13, as amended, recites "manipulating one or more PARTIES (Protected Area Run-Time Interface Extensions Services) service areas."

While "PARTIES (Protected Area Run-Time Interface Extensions Services)" is known in the art, it is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references cited, either singly or in combination, in the context of the limitations recited in claim 13:

> A method for granting access to a protected area of a storage device from a calling process, comprising the steps of: locating an interface using the interface to create a created trusted between the calling process and a system firmware; manipulating one or more PARTIES (Protected Area Run-Time Interface Extensions Services) service areas comprised within the protected area; and closing the protected area when the manipulating the one or more PARTIES service areas is completed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 13. It is submitted that claim 18 is allowable for the same reason as claim 13 from which it depends.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 13 and 18 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is respectfully requested for the reason stated.

(v) Rejection of claims 4-5, 9-11, 15-17 over Moos (US 5,881,152) in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852).

The examiner has further written:

> *d. Referring to claims 4-5, 9-11, 15-17:*
>
> i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 3, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above

Claims 9 – 11 have been canceled. Therefore, rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 4 – 5 depend from claim 1. Claims 15 – 17 depend from claim 13.

As discussed above Moos and Kramer, individually or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 4 and 5 are allowable for the same reason as claim 1 upon which they each depend. Further, claims 4 and 5, as amended, recite the use of SETMAX which is absent, both specifically and by implication, from the cited references.

Claim 15 depends from claim 13. As discussed above Moos and Kramer, individually or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 13. Therefore claim 15 is allowable for the same reason as claim 13 from which it depends.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 13. Therefore claims 16 and 17 are allowable for the same reason as claim 13 from which they each depend. Moreover, claims 16 and 17, as amended, recite the use of SETMAX which is absent, both specifically and impliedly, from the references cited by the examiner.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 17 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is respectfully requested for the reason stated.

(vi) Rejection of claims 8, 14 over Moos (US 5,881,152) in view of Kramer et al (US 5,414,852).

The examiner has further written:

f. Referring to claims 8, 14: i. These claims have limitations that are similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

Claim 8 has been canceled. Therefore the rejection of claim 8 is moot.

Claim 14 depends from claim 13. Therefore claim 14 is allowable for the same reason as claim 13 from which it depends.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC § 103 (a) is respectfully requested for the reason stated.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 – 6 and 13 - 18 are in proper condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayments or credit any over payments to Deposit Account No. 18-0580, referencing Attorney Docket No. 38089-506F01US for any payment in connection with this communication, including any fees for extension of time, which may be required. However, an issue fee may not be charged to this account. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if such action might expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 - 12 - 2009   By: _Geraldine N. Rochino_

Geraldine N. Rochino, Reg. No. 58,147
Attorney for Applicants
c/o MINTZ, LEVIN
5 Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, California 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 251-7700
Fax: (650) 251-7739
Customer No. 23980